



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,640	07/08/2003	Richard Merkin	MERKN-001A	1420

7590 06/26/2008
MATTHEW A. NEWBOLES
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
Suite 250
75 Enterprise
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

EXAMINER

RANGREJ, SHEETAL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/615,640	Applicant(s) MERKIN, RICHARD	
	Examiner SHEETAL R. RANGREJ	Art Unit 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,11,14,16-20 and 26-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,11, 14,16-20,26, 27-33 and 34-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Prosecution History Summary

1. Claims 1 and 19-20 are amended.
2. Claims 2, 8-10, 12-13, 15, 21-25, 27, and 34 are cancelled.
3. Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 14, 16-20, 26, and 28-33, and 35-37 are pending.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/31/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. Claims 1 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
6. The basis of this rejection is based on recent Federal Circuit decisions and Supreme Court precedent in particular, *Diamonn v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1984); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876) which state that the process must:
 - (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus); or
 - (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing.

For a claimed invention to be statutory subject matter eligible, the claimed invention must fall within a judicial exception. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to pass muster, the recited claims should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps or positively recite subject matter that is being transformed for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

7. In the present case, claims 1 and 20 recite an abstract idea only. The claims recite steps and means for a) defining processes, b) forming links between processes, traversing processes by meeting exit requirements. These steps and means do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts since they can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper. These steps and means only constitute an idea of how to define, linking and traversing processes.

8. In particular, explicitly claiming the medium or structure in the body of the claim that performs the underlying process steps would serve to better recite the technological arts within the present set of claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The primary reason that claims 1, 3-7, 11, 14, 16-20, 26-33, and 35-37 distinguish over the prior art is the inclusion of the limitations in all of the claims, that is not found in the prior art, of assessing patient request by a primary care physician, submitting *only* a single CPT code corresponding to a single, specified medical service to be evaluated by a hospitalist or case manager, wherein evaluating the single code submitted comprises (i) the effectiveness or clinical importance of the service required to be rendered, (ii) whether the code is applicable to services that are covered by the patient's health care, and (iii) whether the code is susceptible to duplicative and/or unbundled billing practice or otherwise provides any financial interest to the primary care physician, and then rendering the requested services based on the response of either approval or disapproval; furthermore, repeating the steps to submit codes for utilization of either in-patient services, out-patient services, referral to a specialist, or a combination thereof, wherein the assessment is made by a primary care physician, but the services are performed by a physician other than a primary care physician, and finally when the patient has a chronic condition, repeating the steps to provide treatment of the chronic condition. The closes prior arts (Bond et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,177,940, Peterson et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,343,271, and Finn U.S. Publication No. 2002/0120466) teaches evaluating the single CPT code relating to a medical service by a remote server, wherein evaluation is to determine whether the claim may be automatically adjudicated or manually, furthermore, patient's social security is submitted and evaluation is based of the benefits summary to decide if the patient is eligible for the services and providing treatment and THEN submitting the claim for pre-checking of auto adjudication; Furthermore, submitting codes for utilization of either in-patient services, out-patient services, referral to a specialist, or a combination thereof, wherein the

assessment and the submission of codes is done by a physician other than a primary care physician (Finn). However, Bond, Peterson, and Finn, both individually or in combination fail to teach, "evaluating the single code submitted comprises (i) the effectiveness or clinical importance of the service required to be rendered, (ii) whether the code is applicable to services that are covered by the patient's health care, and (iii) whether the code is susceptible to duplicative and/or unbundled billing practice or otherwise provides any financial interest to the primary care physician; responding to said submission based upon said evaluation comprising either approval or disapproval to proceed with rendering the requested service; assessing said request and determining whether said request substantiates the utilization of either in-patient services, out-patient services, referral to a specialist, or a combination thereof, wherein said assessment is made by a primary care physician and the in-patient services, out-patient services, and services from a specialist are to be performed by a physician other than the primary care physician; and when the patient has a chronic condition, repeating steps of submitting codes, to continuously assess the utilization of the in-patient services, out-patient services, and services from a specialist to provide treatment of the chronic condition.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEETAL R. RANGREJ whose telephone number is (571)270-1368. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Gilligan can be reached on 571-272-6770. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SRR

/C Luke Gilligan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626